

Accreditation Review Handbook
Guidelines
for
Institutions of Higher Education
in the
State of South Dakota

Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality
South Dakota Department of Education
700 Governor's Drive
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-2291
605-773-4774

October 2005

INTRODUCTION

Professional educator program approval is the process through which a team of educators, appointed by the South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE), conducts an assessment of an institution's professional educator program(s.) South Dakota Codified Law 13-42-3 establishes the authority of the South Dakota Board of Education to develop the requirements that institutions must meet in order to gain approval of their teacher preparation programs. **These requirements are set forth in ARSD 24:16 Teacher Preparation Program Approval. ARSD 24:16:02:01 states, "In order to receive and maintain program approval, the unit must submit the following to the department every seven years: 1)An *Institutional Report*, as outlined in the department's Accreditation Review Handbook *Guidelines* for Institutions of Higher Education in the State of South Dakota and 2) Evidence of candidate competencies as required in 24:16. For institutions seeking initial or continuing accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of teacher Education (NCATE), the department shall conduct joint reviews of the unit and its education programs as outlined in the partnership agreement between the department and NCATE. At least once every seven years, the department shall conduct an onsite review of each education unit and each program for the preparation of education personnel offered by a four-year accredited institution. After the department has verified that the standards in article 24:16 have been met by the unit and each program, the South Dakota Board of Education may grant initial or continuing approval to the unit and program that were reviewed."**

This Handbook is prepared to guide the institutions of higher education through the program approval process.

Background

The evolution of accreditation and program approval can be divided into four phases. In the first phase, candidates took courses, completed degree requirements and applied for certification. The Department of Education Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality examined the applicant information and issued a certificate based upon the applicant's successful completion of a state approved program.

In the second phase, the state established standards for accreditation and program approval. Review teams would go to the universities and colleges to review the facilities, budgetary allocations and resources, and required courses and field experiences in light of the standards.

The third phase of accreditation and program approval began with the "performance assessment" focus around the turn of the century approximately in the year 2000. In this

phase, teams selected by the state go to the preparing institutions and review the evidence of the candidates' knowledge and competence. The most important documents are the evidence that support the assessment of the candidates' knowledge and competence e.g., examinations, journals, videotapes, lesson plans, and all of those things that might be found in a portfolio. The focus of the review is on the institution's ability to prepare and assess the knowledge and competence of candidates prior to recommending them for a certification.

This third phase is already transitioning into the next phase of program approval. Many national accrediting bodies are asking institutions to gather data on how their candidates facilitate learning in P-12 students. The performance of the P-12 students is the ultimate performance that professional educators are being prepared to enhance. Many variables come into play when assessing performance on that level. Some of those variables may be beyond the control of veteran teachers, not to mention novice teachers. Still this challenge represents the frontier to which program approval is headed. Program approval in South Dakota is very much a part of the evolutionary process, as evidenced by the requirements of ARSD 24:16. Hopefully, this handbook and the policies and requirements established herein will foster improved preparation programs and ultimately the high quality of professional educators that the children of South Dakota deserve and the future of our state depends.

NCATE

The South Dakota Department of Education is committed to the development of high quality preparation programs and enhancing the contributions to the pool of professional educators by the diversity of institutions throughout the state. The department also recognizes that many of the professional educators who will find employment in the state or seek employment in other states must demonstrate a common core of knowledge, skills and dispositions in order to be effective. To this end, the Department entered a State Partnership Agreement with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educators in 1988 (NCATE). This agreement was renewed in January 2006. The Agreement and Protocol can be reviewed at the NCATE website www.ncate.org. Many of the institutions in South Dakota have chosen to seek NCATE accreditation under the terms prescribed in protocol. This handbook is intended to guide all of the South Dakota preparing institutions through the process of gaining state program approval and where appropriate will reference differences in procedures for NCATE and State approval. Institutions seeking NCATE accreditation should access the NCATE Handbook for Accreditation Visits for more detailed information on the NCATE review process.

Scheduling the Review

Program approval is a continuous process of program improvement that culminates with an on-site accreditation review every seven years. The formal process, leading up to the review, begins two years before the on-site review when the State Consultant in the Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality, notifies the institution that it will be scheduled for an Accreditation Review. *A list of the institutions scheduled during the seven year cycle is contained in the Appendix section of this Handbook.*

The review dates run four consecutive days, beginning the afternoon of the first and concluding by noon on the fourth. **Usually the review will be conducted on Sunday-Wednesday.** Institutions seeking NCATE accreditation must comply with the timelines for requesting dates established in the NCATE Handbook. The SDDOE consultant will confirm the mutually agreed upon dates with the institution and when appropriate with NCATE.

Each institution that is scheduled for a review will plan a *technical assistance* meeting with the state consultant prior to the review dates. During this meeting the consultant from the Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality will review the Accreditation Review process and the format for developing the *Institutional Report* and *Program Report* materials. This meeting is referred to as the “Technical Assistance Visit” because its purpose is to provide assistance in developing the report materials that will be utilized during the accreditation review.

Institutional Report and Program Report Documentation

Each institution is required to prepare an *Institutional Report* (IR) as described in this *Handbook*, and must send a copy to the SDDOE consultant and one copy to each team member at least 30 days prior to the on-site visit. Institutions are encouraged to develop the IR and support documents in an electronic format. Whenever possible a web-based system of information management should be implemented. **When an institution elects to present its *Institutional Report* through an electronic media, it is crucial that a detailed discussion of the electronic process be conducted.** The SDDOE consultant will review the specific information to be sent during the *technical assistance* meeting.

Institutions should be mindful that although electronic presentations of the IR, via CD or the Web, may be convenient for any number of reasons, reviewers tend to read the documents in locations and at times that are not compatible with electronic media. At times it may be more useful to provide access to documentation electronically while providing each reviewer with a hard copy of the *Institutional Report*. This will be discussed further in the *Preparing the Institutional Report* section below.

The *Accreditation Review* focuses on making a determination of the degree to which the institution and its teacher preparation programs comply with the standards and guidelines identified in ARSD 24:16. During the review process, institutions are required to assemble evidence to support the information presented in their *Institutional Report* on how those standards and guidelines are met.

In addition to the unit standards, institutions are required to prepare program review materials that address the specific programs, published in ARSD 24:16, for each teacher preparation program that they intend to offer. The programs that have national standards are aligned with the professional association standards and identify the programmatic requirements of each certification area. More information on the content and structure of

this part of the *Institutional Report* is contained in the *Preparing the Institutional Report* section of this guide.

Program Report Documentation

Each institution is required to prepare a *Program Report* for each program offered as described in this *Handbook*, and must send a copy to the SDDOE consultant, who will distribute to other program reviewers, at least one year prior to the on-site visit. Institutions are encouraged to develop the reports and support documents in an electronic format. Whenever possible a web-based system of information management should be implemented. **When an institution elects to present its program reports through an electronic media, it is crucial that a detailed discussion of the electronic process be conducted.** The SDDOE consultant will review the specific information to be sent during the *technical assistance* meeting.

The *Program Report Review* focuses on making a determination of the degree to which the teacher preparation programs comply with the standards and guidelines identified in ARSD 24:16. The programs that have national standards are aligned with the professional association standards and identify the programmatic requirements of each certification area. More information on the content and structure of the *Program Report* is contained in the appendix section.

Review Team

A review team will be selected to review, verify, and validate the *Institutional Report* and *Program Reports* and report the findings and recommendations to the SDDOE consultant. The team will include a balance of expertise from P-20 education communities. Its composition will include individuals who possess the knowledge and skills necessary to adequately assess the institution and its components and offer recommendations on how to ensure that the unit and programs operate within the regulations. The team will be comprised of people trained in the review process, who engage in similar reviews on a regular basis. Institutions seeking NCATE accreditation will have team members assigned by NCATE as well as teams members appointed by the SDDOE.

The team's role is a combination of auditing, verifying findings and observing actual performance through visits to institutions, interviews, and the review of the institutional evidence and candidate portfolios. The team will have at least 4 members, including the SDDOE consultant, a South Dakota Education Association (SDEA) representative, a representative from P-12 education, and a representative from higher education, all whom have been trained previously in the review process.

The institution is responsible for the subsistence, lodging, and travel costs for team members.

Pre-visit

Approximately 90 - 60 days prior to the on-site review, the SDDOE consultant will meet with the institution's review coordinator to make the final arrangements for the visit. This

meeting should be coordinated with the NCATE pre-visit at institutions undergoing joint reviews. The pre-visit is a very important part of the major program approval process. It provides an opportunity for a focused discussion of the SDDOE expectations and the institution's state of readiness for the activities that will take place during the review. During the pre-visit the state consultant has the responsibility to interact with the coordinator in establishing the collaborative tone for the review.

During the pre-visit, a draft of the required *Institutional Report* should be available in order to review the organization of materials and confirm the size of the team. When the institution intends to use a web-based review, the website should be in place and reviewed. A tentative schedule of the on-site activities should be developed. A detailed schedule of activities, interviews, class visits, etc., should be reviewed by the team chair, in coordination with the SDDOE liaison and the institution's coordinator, at least 30 days prior to the actual visit. A checklist of pre-visit agenda items is contained in the Appendix section of this Handbook. *The NCATE Handbook for Accreditation Visits contains a pre-visit checklist for NCATE institutions.*

On-site Review

Accreditation visits run for four days, beginning with the opening of the exhibit room, an orientation, team meeting, and reception/dinner on the first day and ending with an exit report around noon on the fourth day. The institution should provide the review team with a hotel and on-campus workroom for its exclusive use during the visit. An exhibit room, including all of the materials identified under *preparing for the visit* in this document, should also be created in close proximity to the workroom, if space is not available in the workroom.

When planning the exhibit room, attention should be paid to the transportation of materials. Team members will normally begin the review of the exhibits on the first day, prior to the reception. They may want to continue this process following the reception and on the morning of the second day. Procedures for moving materials from campus to the hotel workroom should be discussed.

At the conclusion of the visit, the SDDOE consultant will conduct an oral exit report with the appropriate institutional personnel. During reviews at NCATE institutions the NCATE chair will conduct the exit with the SDDOE consultant in attendance. The institutional personnel who will attend the exit interview are determined by the institution. The purpose of the report is to highlight the overall findings of the team and to give the institution a sense of what will be sent to South Dakota Board of Education (SDBOE) and/or NCATE. The actual findings and recommendations will be formally presented in a report to SDBOE that will form the basis for the decision on the program approval status of the institution. The process for transmitting the report and findings is described below.

Final Report

The state consultant has 30 days to prepare the draft of the report for non-NCATE accredited institutions. The report includes the findings of the team members regarding the

ability of the institution and its programs to operate in accordance with the requirements identified in the ARSD 24.16.

The state consultant prepares and forwards a draft of the report, including the team's findings, recommendations, and overall recommendation regarding approval to team members for review and editing. Team members have five days to respond to the consultant. The consultant incorporates revisions from team members and forwards the report to the institution to review and respond to standards and guidelines that were "*not met*" or identified as having "*areas for improvement.*" A copy of the final report and the institution's response is sent to the institution and a copy is filed in the Office Accreditation and Teacher Quality.

Final approval decisions are made by the SDBOE and are conveyed in writing to the president of the institution and the head of the professional education program within 30 days. Representatives from the institution are invited to be in attendance when the report to the board is delivered.

The South Dakota Board of Education makes one of the four following accreditation decisions:

- 7 year, ***Full Approval***
- 2 year, ***Conditional Approval*** with a visit to the institution monitoring any standard(s) that were determined to be ***met with significant areas for improvement.***
- 1 year, ***Probationary Approval*** with a visit to the institution monitoring any standard(s) that were determined to be ***not met or with significant areas for improvement.*** Those candidates presently in the program as juniors or seniors may complete the program no new candidates are allowed until the deficiencies are corrected.
- Denial, ***the program approval is removed.*** No graduates of such program(s) are authorized for certification, who ever an institution may appeal. See below for the *appeals process.*

Written notification of the state board's decision is filed with the Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality and sent to the institution within 30 days of the decision.

When Conditional or Probationary Approval is granted or when a program(s) is denied approval, the institution has sixty (60) days to respond in writing to the state consultant, if it disagrees with the decision. **It is expected that at times, an institution will receive Conditional or Probationary Approval based on the number of its programs that have been identified with concerns from the program reviewers prior to the on-site review.**

Any institution that receives *Conditional* or *Probationary Approval* is required to submit a plan for addressing the *areas for improvement* and a timeline for implementing the corrective action within the time limitations of the approval status. Specifics of reporting and follow-up visits will be negotiated between SDDOE and the institution.

When an institution and/or any of its professional educator programs is Denied or put on Probationary status, the following steps must be taken:

- 1) Terminate the admission of candidates to the program
- 2) All candidates who are presently enrolled in the program must be formally notified of the decision. The formal notification must explain the basis for the denial or probation and inform each candidate of the courses that must be taken in order to complete the program or transfer into another program.
- 3) The Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality must be forwarded a list of the candidates that were notified. The list must include the name, social security number, number of credits needed, and anticipated completion date. The completion date cannot be longer than 3 semesters from the date of the denial.

Discontinuing and/or Modifying a Program

When an institution decides to discontinue a professional educator program, the procedure outlined above should be followed. Because this decision may have adverse consequences for the candidates, the institution is responsible for making every effort to facilitate their completion of the program. These efforts should include collaborating with other institutions in the area in accepting coursework, transferring credits and completing other required activities that candidates may need for certification.

When an institution seeks to modify any of its professional educator programs the planned modifications should be discussed with the State Consultant in the Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality. Many programmatic changes are minor, such as changes in course sequences and the offering of alternative electives not identified on the advisement sheet utilized during the program approval review. These types of modifications do not need the approval or formal notification of the SDDOE. **However, more significant program changes, such as those relating to the Unit Standards or other requirements specifically identified in ARSD 24:16, must be submitted in writing at least 90 days prior to the planned implementation date.** The submittal must identify: 1) the rationale, 2) the identified changes, 3) the programs, 4) the implementation date, and 5) a revised advisement sheet, when appropriate. The State Consultant will review the modification for consistency with the provision of ARSD 24.16 and provide written notification of acceptance or concerns to the institution.

Conditions for Follow-up Reviews

When an institution or any of its programs receives a Probationary or Conditional Approval for one or two years, a follow-up review must be conducted the final semester of the approval period. The follow-up review will be conducted by the SDDOE consultant. This would be the case in such instances when advisement sheets were cited as inaccurate

or inadequate or when performances on the Praxis examinations were an area for improvement. In other instances, it may be necessary for a programmatic team member(s) to return to the institution for the follow-up. Some examples of this would be when insufficient evidence of candidate knowledge and competence was available, or when the studies could not be verified through the syllabi, or when significant programmatic changes have to be implemented due to inadequate scope of studies or field experiences. **The costs associated with the follow-up reviews must also be paid by the institution.**

Levels of Compliance

The validation process includes rating the extent to which standards have been met. Each standard is rated and assigned a level of compliance based on specific criteria. Determination of the level must be supported by documentation.

Criteria:

Standard Met with Strength.

A standard may be rated as met with strength when it has been determined through the validation process that the institution clearly exceeds the expectations of the standard or implements the standard in a unique or exemplary manner which merits recognition. A descriptive statement and a commendation is included in the report along with documented findings that the standard has been met with strength.

Standard Met.

The rating of standard met indicates that the expectations of the standard have been satisfied. Documentation that the program meets the standard is included in the report.

Standard Met with Concern

A standard is rated as met with concern(s) when it has been determined through the validation process that a component of the standard cannot be confirmed as met or that significant improvement in implementation is advisable for part of or all of the standard. This rating must be supported by a description of the documented findings of deficiency and includes recommendations in the report.

Standard Not Met.

A standard is rated as not met when it has been determined through the validation process that the intent of the standard has not been addressed or that implementation has been deficient to the extent of negatively affecting the program. The rating must be supported by a description of the documented findings of deficiency and includes recommendations in the report.

Preparing the Institutional Report

Each institution seeking Accreditation is required to prepare a *Institutional Report* (IR) document that identifies how the institution meets the requirements established under ARSD 24.16. Each institution should obtain a copy of the **South Dakota Department of Education Accreditation Review Handbook** prior to beginning the *Institutional Report* development process. A copy of this document is posted on the Department of Education's website at www.doe.state.sd.gov. Institutions seeking NCATE accreditation should also obtain a copy of the **NCATE Handbook for Accreditation Visits**, from their website found at www.ncate.org

When an institution begins the accreditation process, the emphasis should be on improving the unit's program(s) by examining its present design and performance in light of the standards and guidelines. Once the institution has identified this information and assigned the responsibility for conducting the internal review of the various aspects of the program(s), it is ready to begin the writing of the *Institutional Report*. The template for the *Institutional Report* is contained in the Appendix section of this Handbook.

The content of the *Institutional Report* should include an introduction which provides an overview of the institution and familiarizes the review team with the history of the institution and the present teacher education program.

Responses to the *Institutional Report* are written indicating how the institution meets each standard listed in the ARSD Rules 24:16 governing Teacher Preparation Program Approval. Which include a description of the unit's conceptual framework and evidence that demonstrates that ARSD Rules 24:16 are met. In continuing accreditation visits, the IR also serves as documentation of the unit's growth and development since the last accreditation visit.

The unit is required to submit two copies of its *Institutional Report* to the Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality, one copy to each state team member assigned to review each standard, and one copy for the SDEA representative. If the institution is an NCATE institution, each NCATE team member must have a copy. The IR may be submitted electronically.

An *Institutional Report* should include a cover sheet that identifies:

1. The name and address of the unit and institution.
2. The dates of the scheduled visit.
3. The unit's website address.
4. The accreditation review coordinator.
5. A table of contents and three sections.
 - Overview of the Institution
 - Conceptual Framework
 - Evidence for Meeting Each Standard

Overview of the Institution

This section sets the context of the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution and the unit. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses included in the review, other off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs. The overview should include any other information to help the review team understand the unit (e.g., residential or commuter, religious affiliation, and characteristics of the student body. This section should also list all programs offered by the unit that prepare individuals to work in P-12 schools.

Conceptual Framework

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework (s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework and its development. For continuing visits, changes in the conceptual framework since the last visit should be related to revised or refined unit, professional, and/or state standards and assessments. The framework should summarize the following six structural elements; (1) shared vision, (2) coherence, (3) professional commitments and disposition, (4) commitment to diversity, (5) commitment to technology, and (6) candidate aligned with professional and state standards.

Evidence for Meeting Each Standard

In this section the unit should discuss the evidence and provide data that demonstrates that it is meeting each chapter and section in Article 24:16.

Catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, teaching majors and advanced degrees. If required courses for each teaching major and advanced degrees are not included in the catalog, send the document(s) which list the required courses.

Two copies of each of these documents should be sent to the Office of Accreditation and Teacher Quality and single copies to the state team chair, each team member and the SDEA observer. These documents should be received at least one month prior to the site visit.

Schedule of classes offered over the past 3 years - present schedule of classes with locations, times and instructors. Staff schedule indicating times when individual instructors would be available for interviews. This is to include the location of the instructor's office and telephone number. E-Mail number also if technology allows dialoging in this media.

The institution should assemble as much supporting documentation as possible in the Exhibit Room. The team should not need to go to another location for written documents that support the *Institutional Report* and show how the state standards are being met. (Exceptions to this would be reviewing transcripts in the Registrar's office and examining student files in their permanent location.)

- Course syllabi for all required courses in each of the teaching majors and advanced degrees. (Grouped by program.)
- Course syllabi for all general education courses.
- All printed documents relating to the teacher education programs.
- List of courses and schedule of classes in session during the site visit.
- Schedule of course offerings for the past five years, including off-campus courses.
- List of names, office numbers, campus phone numbers and available hours for current instructors of all required courses including part-time and/or adjunct.
- Examples of student work. (Identify the course in which the work was completed.)
- Follow-up studies of graduates conducted over the past five years.
- Handbooks distributed for student teachers and field experiences.
- Written agreements with local schools for student teaching placement and other collaborative activities.
- Admission policies and criteria.
- Documents relating to advising students.
- List of competencies expected at completion of programs and assessments used to ensure these outcomes.
- Faculty handbook.
- Faculty evaluation instruments.
- Examples of faculty publications.
- Documents that describe the governance and operations of the teacher education program. (e.g., organizational chart for the instruction.
- Minutes of advisory groups and governing groups.
- Fiscal records and budgets for the past five years of the college/department of education and other colleges/departments within the institution to determine equity of funds.
- List of library acquisitions for the past five years which relate to the teacher education programs and advanced degrees.
- Documents relating to facilities.
- Documents listed in the *Institutional Report* as sources for verification.
- Documentation the organizational structure identifying responsibilities.

The unit is to have notified personnel that team members will need access to transcripts for current students and recent graduates (within the last 5 years). Team members will also examine student files which contain advising and assessment information; and evaluation forms for student teaching, field experiences and evidence of required competencies.

Introduction

The first section of the document must contain an introduction to the institution, including:

- an identification of the degree(s) and professional educator program(s) offered,
- a description of the demographics of the students who enroll in your teacher preparation programs,
- any other contextual information that will help the review team develop an understanding of the mission, standards, and culture of the institution.

This brief introduction will introduce the institution to the members of the review team and provide the context for the data that follows. It should be made available electronically or sent in hard copy to all team members along with the other *Institutional Report* documents.

The *Institutional Report* must provide the review team with enough information to suggest that the program(s) is in compliance with the requirements. **References should be made to specific documents that support the claims made in the report.** Rather than including all of the documents as attachments, the institution should identify the location of the documents in the exhibit room or other campus locations. This is not to suggest that examples of the evidence should not be provided in the narrative. When a specific document is common to all programs and is relatively brief, e.g., an advisement sheet, a sample should be attached to the report. **The discussion of the General Standards should not exceed 40 pages.** The “forty pages” suggestion is a guide and should not be construed to mean that narratives of greater length will not be accepted.

There are some General Standards that lend themselves to a listing of evidence from across many of the programs. This narrative should summarize the collaborative activities and faculty scholarship and service activities. Examples of these activities and/or publications should be identified in the discussion.

Support Documents and Forwarding the Institutional Report

It is very important to identify the evidence that can be reviewed in support of the institution and its programs meeting the standards and guidelines. The narrative of the Institutional Report, the syllabi, the matrices, and the vitae serve as the maps to the evidence. The guideline or standard cannot be met solely on the basis of the information presented in those documents.

Forwarding the documents

The *Institutional Report* should be forwarded to the team members approximately 30 days prior to the review. Because the documents tend to be long, the institution should prepare electronic documents for each team member rather than sending paper support documents.

Increasingly institutions are developing Web-based *Institutional Report* reports and supporting documents. **When the Institutional Report is Web-based, a hard copy or CD must be sent to the SDDOE consultant.** Explicit instructions for accessing the site must be provided to all team members as well as an e-mail address for team members to use if

they experience any difficulties. Institutions should be aware that from time to time some team members may request a hard copy of materials stored on the Web. It is the institution's responsibility to provide the requested materials within reason. The team chair and/or SDDOE consultant should be contacted in those cases where the request appears to be unreasonable.

Preparing for the On-site Review

The purpose of the on-site review is to determine how the professional education program(s) comply(ies) with the program approval standards and guidelines by verifying the information reported in the *Institutional Report* and making recommendations to SDDOE for improvement. In preparing for the on-site review, there are several factors that the institution must consider.

Documenting the Institutional Report

The *Institutional Report* describes the operation of the institution and the professional educator programs in the context of the requirements of the unit standards and program guidelines. The primary tasks of the team are to verify the information reported in the *Institutional Report* through review of primary documentation, observation and interviews, and to make recommendations to SDDOE. The *Institutional Report* must reference the documents that will be used for verification purposes. The institution must assemble the documentation in an exhibit room or via electronic media, whenever possible. The exhibit room must be organized so that it allows ready access to documents that were identified. Because of the confidential nature of some of the documents, institutions may choose to provide information that identifies where the documents can be obtained and reviewed.

Examples of documents that might be collected for the exhibit room are: minutes from committee meetings, manuals and handbooks, policies and procedures, sample advisement sheets, syllabi, faculty vitae, publications, and samples of candidate products. When candidate portfolios are used, some consideration should be given to displaying those of candidates who will not be available for interviews. **Candidates that will participate in interviews with members of the team should be encouraged to bring their portfolio to the interview.**

Professional educator programs must develop a course/program matrix that demonstrates how the courses meet the specific program guidelines and how course requirements are used to demonstrate candidate knowledge and competence. The developed matrix must be supported by course syllabi that also identify the required studies and experiences contained in the guidelines. A matrix that simply refers to a syllabus is not an acceptable form of documentation.

It should be noted that the fact that the topics are covered in a course and reflected on the syllabus is only one indication that the guideline is met. The guidelines state that the program must document the candidates' "knowledge of and competence in" applying the concepts. **To that end, the *Institutional Report* must direct the reviewer to the evidence that the candidates learned what was taught rather than the presentation**

that the topics were covered. The matrix must reflect this concern. A matrix that merely shows the courses in which the guidelines are covered is inadequate. The matrix must also show the method/product that will be required to demonstrate that candidates learned the topics identified in the guidelines and covered in the courses.

Consideration should be given to the layout of the exhibit room to ensure that adequate space is available for reviewing the materials. **Although the exhibit room may serve as the team's on-campus workroom, it should not be used for interviews during the visit.** The exhibit room should be equipped with personal computers and a printer if it will serve as the team's on-campus workroom.

Team members may want to transport some of the exhibits to the hotel. Provisions should be made to facilitate this process. In part, this will depend upon the location of the initial meeting on the first day of the review. When the initial meeting is on campus, the team members can select the materials to take to the hotel. When the initial meeting is at the hotel, the institution and team would be best served by setting up some samples of the exhibits there. **It is very important that these details be worked out during the pre-visit.**

When the institution elects to use an electronic medium for presenting the *Institutional Report* and support documents, access to the materials from the hotel and campus workroom must be ensured. Keep in mind that most team members want to read long documents in hard copy.

Developing the Agenda

Interviews are another method that the team will use to verify and validate information presented in the *Institutional Report*. **A tentative agenda should be developed by the institution and discussed during the pre-visit.** In developing the agenda, careful attention should be given to scheduling activities in a manner that ensures that adequate time is allocated to the various aspects of the program. In addition to scheduling time for the team to become familiar with the exhibit room and other campus facilities, the team will need to interview administrators, faculty, candidates, and personnel from cooperating local schools.

A typical agenda would begin with a team meeting followed by a dinner/reception on the first day of the review. The dinner/reception allows the team members to meet with faculty and administrators prior to the actual interviews. Specific arrangements for the first afternoon and evening should be discussed during the pre-visit. In making the arrangements, it should be kept in mind that the team has very little time together prior to beginning the on-campus activities. A well-planned first day will get the review off to a good start.

On the morning of the second day, the team should be transported to the exhibit room. At least 30 minutes should be scheduled for the team to become familiar with the exhibits and campus layout before the actual interviews begin. Following this initial period on campus,

the meetings with administrators, faculty and support personnel should be scheduled. These meetings should not run more than 40 minutes with a 15-minute break occurring between each. The team is usually divided up in order to cover assigned areas so that concurrent meetings can be scheduled.

It is important for reviewers to meet with representatives from each of the programs that they are assigned. General Standards Reviewers primarily meet with administrators, while Program Reviewers meet with various faculty members responsible for the assigned area of preparation. Faculty interviews are normally scheduled in the morning with student interviews scheduled for the afternoon. However, if candidates are available only in the morning and some faculty are available only at specific times during the day, alternative arrangements should be made.

A team lunch should be scheduled at a place where the team can discuss the progress of the review and identify areas that may require additional verification. At times it may be necessary to schedule someone for an interview during the lunch, but as a rule, the lunch should be a working lunch for the **team members only**. The choice of using a campus dining facility or bringing the lunch to the workroom should be discussed during the pre-visit.

Following lunch, the team would continue interviews with faculty, administrators and candidates. Whenever possible, meetings with candidates should be organized into small groups of five to ten candidates. Small groups of faculty, organized by department or function i.e., chairs, are also a viable way of scheduling interviews.

The early afternoon may be the best time to schedule interviews with current candidates while late hours of the afternoon may be a more convenient time to schedule interviews with student teachers, graduates, cooperating teachers and administrators, who have to leave their places of employment in order to participate in the process. The full day on campus is a very long day and as a rule, interviews should not be scheduled after 5 P.M. **Institutions should make considerable effort to ensure that a wide cross-section, if not all, of the programs are represented by the student teachers and cooperating school district personnel during the interviews.**

On the final day of the review, the team works primarily at the hotel. Normally, the only on-campus activity is the exit report. This should take place in the late morning. The specific time should be discussed during the pre-visit and confirmed prior to the team leaving the campus. The exit report allows the team chair to provide the institution with a preliminary list of strengths and concerns. Program approval status and specific recommendations are not presented at that time. The representatives from the institution that will be invited to the exit report should be discussed during the pre-visit.

A sample On-site Review Schedule is presented in Appendix IV. **This sample schedule is intended to be a guide.** The actual schedule of activities should be negotiated beginning at the pre-visit and continuing through the final day on campus.

Preparing the Budget

The costs associated with the SDDOE consultant's participation in the technical assistance visit are the responsibility of the Department of Education. This pre-visit should be conducted approximately 60-90 days prior to the review.

The costs associated with the review, including the reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and lodging of the team, are the responsibility of the institution. In planning for these costs, the size of the team should be one of the first considerations. An institution should have a sense of the team size when it submits the letter identifying the dates of the review and the options for developing the *Institutional Report* and *Program Reports* at the end of the school year prior to the review.

Hotel accommodations should be planned so that each member of the team has a separate room. The hotel should also have a workroom large enough to accommodate the team, with additional space for at least two personal computer workstations. This workroom should be available throughout the review. When possible, the institution should consider selecting a hotel with or near a dining facility. Planned group meals at the hotel and on campus may help in controlling the budget and reduce the need for the direct reimbursement of team members. When group meals are not planned, the institution should provide for meal charges to be billed to the room. The allowable amount should be made clear to the team chair.

In addition to the obvious meals, the institution should budget for refreshments in the hotel workroom and the campus exhibits room. Miscellaneous costs such as parking and turnpike fees should also be considered. Reimbursement of the costs should be consistent with the institution's policy. Reimbursement forms and instructions may be sent to the team members with the *Institutional Report* or provided upon arrival at the hotel.

The transportation of team members from the hotel to the campus is one final factor that should be considered in preparing the budget. Details of the transportation plan should be discussed with the SDDOE consultant.

The participation in the program approval process is voluntary and reflective of the high level of professional commitment of the team members. Any form of financial payments to team members, other than reimbursement of costs associated with the review, is prohibited.

Checklist of Pre-visit Agenda Items

90-60 days before on-site review

- (1) Confirm accuracy of the Notification form information.
- (2) Determine the status of the *Institutional Report*.
- (3) Discuss status of the program reviews.
- (4) Identify the number of team members.
- (5) Confirm the dates and review the tentative schedule of activities.
- (6) Identify administrators, faculty, staff, and other groups that will be interviewed.
- (7) Identify whether the first afternoon meeting will take place on campus or at the hotel and locate the exhibits accordingly.
- (8) Review expectations for the first afternoon and the evening reception/dinner, as well as the meals throughout the visit.
- (9) Identify when the *Institutional Report* will be sent and what support documents, including directions to hotel and campus, will be forwarded to the team. (Provide a draft, if possible.)
- (10) Discuss the organization of the exhibit room, including work areas, personal computers, documents, hours of availability, and refreshments.
- (11) Discuss the hotel accommodations, including the workroom, personal computers, meals, refreshments, and travel reimbursement.
- (12) Discuss transportation to and from campus.
- (14) Discuss the support personnel that will be available, including student escorts and technical support for equipment in hotel and campus exhibits room.

Accreditation Review Timeline

SDDOE notifies institution two years prior to the review

Institution notifies SDDOE of dates and options

SDDOE provides institutional orientation “technical assistance” for writing of reports prior to review

SDDOE selects team members for program and on-site review approximately 18 months prior to review

Institution submits *program reports* to SDDOE 18 months prior to review

Program review begins 14 months prior to on-site review.

Program review completed and sent to institution, 12 months prior to on-site review

Institution submits rejoinder to SDOE consultant nine months prior to on-site review

Pre-visit with institution, SDDOE consultant 90 - 60 days prior to review

Institutional Report forwarded to SDDOE and team at least 30 days prior to review

Accreditation review takes place on campus as scheduled

State consultant forwards an electronic draft report to team members within 30 days following review, team members return five days later

SDDOE consultant forwards report to the institution

Institution responds to SDDOE within 30 days after receipt

SDDOE consultant recommends approval status to South Dakota Board of Education within 30 days of receipt

Program Approval Letter is forwarded to institution within 30 days of SDBOE approval

Appeals to South Dakota Department of Education within 30 days

Follow-up *Reviews* one and two years, as appropriate

Appendix

SCHEDULE FOR STATE REVIEW TEAM - SITE ACCREDITATION VISIT	
FIRST DAY (Sunday) 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Orientation and Team Work Session: 6:30 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. 8:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.	Meeting room near exhibits. ORIENTATION SESSION. Meeting room on campus. Review documents in exhibit room, identify incomplete or missing data, outline plans for interviews and collection of comparative data, and complete worksheets. <i>Dinner</i> (location determined by institution) Meeting room motel/hotel. Continue work session.
SECOND DAY (Monday) 7:30 a.m. - 8:00 a.m. 8:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. 12:00 noon Working Lunch: 1:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. 6:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m. 8:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m. Work Session:	<i>Breakfast</i> (location determined by institution) On campus. Continue review of documents and follow interview schedule. <i>Lunch</i> (location determined by institution) Report findings and identify additional documents needed. Follow interview schedule, attend campus classes. <i>Dinner</i> (location determined by institution) Meeting room at motel/hotel. Update findings, schedule follow-up interviews, attend night classes. Team consensus building on compliance.
THIRD DAY (Tuesday) 7:30 a.m. - 8:00 a.m. 8:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. 12:00 noon 1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	<i>Breakfast</i> (location determined by institution) Visit school sites, attend campus classes and conduct follow-up interviews. <i>Working Lunch</i> To finalize collection of data, Report findings, team reaches consensus of level of compliance for each standard, and begin writing validation forms.
FOURTH DAY (Wednesday) 8:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. 12:00 noon	State Team Chair prepares for exit interview. Exit Interview with institution.

**INITIAL INFORMATION FORM
ACCREDITATION REVIEW****Institutional Information**

Chief Executive Officer's Name_____

Chief Executive Officer's Title_____

Institution Name_____

Address_____

City_____State_____Zip_____

Type of Institution (Public, Private,
Tribal)_____

Institution is Accredited by:

Name_____Date of Last Visit_____

Name_____Date of Last Visit_____

Education Unit Information

Education Dean's Name_____

Review Coordinator's Name_____

Joint NCATE/State Review (yes/no)_____State Review Only (yes/no)_____

Number of Programs Offered; Undergraduate_____Graduate_____

List three preferred dates for the accreditation on-site review between March 1st and April 30th.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Signature of Chief Executive Officer_____
Date_____
Signature of Education Dean_____
Date

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REPORTS

General Directions

The following directions are designed to assist institutions as they complete the program report. The following information provides a general overview of the report. More specific information for completing each section follows.

Cover Sheet - The Cover Sheet provides basic information about the program being submitted.

Section I. Context Information – provides the opportunity for institutions to present general information to help reviewers understand the program

Section II. Assessments and Related Data – provides the opportunity for institutions to list their 6 to 8 key assessments.

Section III. Standards Assessment Chart - provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate which of the assessments are being used to determine if candidates meet program standards.

Section IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards – provides the opportunity for institutions to discuss the assessments and assessment data in terms of standards and to submit 6-8 assessments, scoring guides or criteria, and assessment data as evidence that standards are being met.

Section V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate how faculty is using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and effects on student learning.

Page limits are specified for each of the narrative responses required in Sections I, IV and V of the report, with each page approximately equivalent to one text page of single-spaced, 12-point type or 2000 characters (including spaces). Each attachment required in Sections I and IV of the report should be kept, if possible, to a maximum of five text pages.